

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/938,920	08/24/2001	J. Michael Milliorn	P02167US0	3498
26271 7	11/21/2003		EXAMINER	
FULBRIGHT	UGHT & JAWORSKI, LLP AHMAD, NASSER			NASSER
1301 MCKINN SUITE 5100	NEY		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER	
	TX 77010-3095		1772	
			DATE MAILED: 11/21/2003	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

•			ah 9
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Advisory Action	09/938,920	MILLIORN ET AL.	
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit	•
	Nasser Ahmad	1772	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 21 October 2003 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this applica) a timely filed amendment whicl	ation. A proper repl h places the applica	y to a tion in
PERIOD FOR RI	EPLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing			
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WA: 706.07(f).	later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	g date of the final rejecti	on.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Off timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 (a)	of extension and the corresponding amo the shortened statutory period for reply ice later than three months after the mai	ount of the fee. The apport originally set in the final	opriate extension Office action; or
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF	s Brief must be filed within the pe R 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal o	eriod set forth in f the appeal.	
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered b	ecause:		,
(a) they raise new issues that would require furth	er consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note	below);		
(c) they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	in better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or sir	mplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without cancel	ling a corresponding number of f	inally rejected claim	S . ,
NOTE:			
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejections.	ction(s):		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	I be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed	amendment
5. ☑ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☑ request for application in condition for allowance because: See		dered but does NO	T place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered bed raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY t	o issues which were	e newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendmen explanation of how the new or amended claims w			and an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>22-38</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 04-01)

10. Other: ____

8. The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner.

9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.

Nasser Ahmad Primary Examiner Art Unit: 1772 Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the method of Voy may be different but the claimed invention is directed to a label product and, as mentioned in the last Office Action of August 28, 2003, paragraph-5, the process is not germane to the issue of patentability of the product, and hence, the claimed process steps have not been given patentable weight.